

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

DANIELLE MARIE WEITZEL,
Plaintiff,
v.
OFFICER B. JOHNSON, et al.,
Defendants.

No. 2:24-cv-2999 CSK P

ORDER AND FINDINGS &
RECOMMENDATIONS

By order filed March 24, 2025, plaintiff's complaint was dismissed and thirty days leave to file an amended complaint was granted. Thirty days from that date have now passed, and plaintiff has not filed an amended complaint, or otherwise responded to the Court's order.

Although it appears from the file that plaintiff's copy of the order was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to keep the Court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

In accordance with the above, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Clerk of the Court is directed to assign a district judge to this case; and

IT IS RECOMMENDED that this action be dismissed without prejudice. See Local Rule 110; Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(b).

///

1 These findings and recommendations are submitted to the United States District Judge
2 assigned to the case, pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Within fourteen days
3 after being served with these findings and recommendations, plaintiff may file written objections
4 with the court and serve a copy on all parties. Such a document should be captioned
5 “Objections to Magistrate Judge’s Findings and Recommendations.” Plaintiff is advised that
6 failure to file objections within the specified time may waive the right to appeal the District
7 Court’s order. Martinez v. Ylst, 951 F.2d 1153 (9th Cir. 1991).

8
9 Dated: May 1, 2025

10 
11 CHI SOO KIM
12 UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

13 /l/weiz2999.fta
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28